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Abstract

In the era of globalization, intercultural communication plays a pivotal role in the business arena. New markets are emerging and managers tend to be relocated from their domestic markets and cooperate with people from different cultural backgrounds. Organizations are challenged to effectively handle the cultural integration not only within the corporate environment, but also implement the appropriate strategies to achieve the external communication goals. Practitioners have to enable different negotiation strategies in order to reach the organizational goals and organizations should provide them with the best intercultural awareness training. As the difference in international negotiation processes affect the outcome of a negotiation, it is of crucial importance to empirically examine in this study the relationship between the two main negotiation strategies namely, integrative and distributive influence on the negotiation performance outcome and define how communicators’ intercultural awareness level influences this relationship. The conducted survey showed that the integrative negotiation strategy has a significant influence on the negotiation performance outcome compared to distributive strategy. Distributive strategy not only results in less effective negotiation performance but has a negative association with performance outcome. However, the research revealed that communicators’ intercultural awareness level eradicates the influence of integrative strategy on negotiation performance outcome. Unexpectedly, it is found that the relation between the integrative negotiation strategy and performance outcome is mediated by practitioners’ intercultural awareness level.

This study serves as a good starting point in the research of intercultural background effect on the employment of negotiation strategies and the performance outcome. Directions for future studies, theoretical and practical implications are given.
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The propagation and acceptance of globalization have brought a plethora of developments and have led to tremendous changes in the business environment. Companies become international and the geopolitical orientation has created new vast markets and organizations need more skillful organizational members in order to achieve new business goals overseas (Okoro, 2012). Therefore, intercultural awareness is indispensable for interacting and negotiating with people from different cultural backgrounds: “international and intercultural work has become the norm for more large companies” (Earley & Peterson, 2004, p 100). The integration of the world’s markets has led to a communication revolution and increased the importance of local, international and intercultural understanding (Hofstede, 2002). These new challenges have been brought not only to business but also to corporate communication strategies, specifically external communication as the public relations is shaped by the cultures and societies in which it operates (Edwards, 2011).

Additionally, due to globalization, many organizations’ communicators often move from their domestic markets to different countries and work in a multicultural environment (Earley & Preston, 2004). Companies need to implement effective communication strategies in order to prevent cultural misunderstanding and achieve greater business success, as it is essential for interaction with individuals from other cultures (Landers, 2017). Corporations have adopted communication strategies which are necessary in order to confront a communication “problem” and to reach an agreement when the solution requires the activation of a particular strategic plan (Faerch & Casper, 1984).

Furthermore, Edwards (2011), argues that there is a sociocultural “turn” in PR scholarship, because in order to constitute a productive interaction, practitioners from different cultural backgrounds should be aware of sociocultural diversity. This “turn” confirms that cultural dimensions shape the communication strategy of organizations. This has a pivotal impact on communication practitioners, who are expected to accomplish the external organizational objectives, related to diverse stakeholders in the intercultural business environment. According to Hall (1993), practitioners encompass relevant communication strategies, such as negotiation strategies to achieve the external organizational goals. A negotiation is defined as the “Bargaining process between two or more parties (each with its own aims, needs, and viewpoints) seeking to discover a common ground and reach an
agreement to settle a matter of mutual concern or resolve a conflict.” (Business Dictionary, n.d.). Negotiation is an integral part of numerous interpersonal and organizational interactions, and despite the extensive nature of negotiation in social interactions, it’s not uncommon for individuals to fail in obtaining beneficial outcomes for both parties (Olekalns & Smith, 2013). Negotiation strategies enable communicators to resolve conflicts and provoked issues between organizations on a continual basis (Hall, 1993). Successful integrative negotiations benefit all parties, both developing and developed countries (Ogliastri & Quintanilla, 2016).

Current research aims to give insights in practitioners performance in order to provide them with better skills retrieved from negotiation strategies. Hofstede has investigated the crucial cultural impact on the workplace and created the dominating “paradigm” which significantly influenced the field of cross-cultural management (Fang, 2010). Thus, practitioners should be well trained in order to accept new challenges in the intercultural environment, where cultural misunderstanding could be eliminated by cross-training and through exposure to other cultures (Johnson, Lenartowicz & Apud, 2006).

Townsend and Cairns (2003) argue that the separation of culture from global business is considered as “blindness”. Therefore, intercultural awareness is a necessity for organizations in order to interact across cultural borders, due to the cultural impact on people’s behavior. Different academics and practitioners use terms such as intercultural awareness, cultural awareness and cross-cultural competence in order to describe the same term. For the purpose of this research the term “intercultural awareness” will be used as it is considered to be the most suitable. Intercultural awareness is defined by Johnson et al. (2006, p. 534) as the person’s ability to use a combination of knowledge and skills in order to interact and successfully work with individuals from local culture and international business as well. This term is linked with stakeholders engaged in business, where intercultural awareness provides communicators with the ability to overcome potential misunderstandings during negotiation with stakeholders from other countries (Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989).

The examination of the concept of “negotiation strategies” and “intercultural awareness” among stakeholders in the business environment conceive a place in the existing literature, but it has never and nor will it ever be sufficiently analyzed as it is continuously changing. In the era of globalization, where people from all over the world increasingly
collaborate with one another while at the same time combining their cultures; Cultural integration is perceived as a necessity in order to achieve the defined organizational goals. Thus, we should continue to explore exactly how different strategies could influence communication settings and therefore business goals. In this research, the examination of the effect of the two main strategies of the negotiation, the integrative and the distributive strategy on the negotiation performance outcome within intercultural framework is proposed. Previous research, originating from cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2001), emphasizes the cultural diversity which has provoked misperceptions during interaction (Ogliastri & Quintanilla, 2016), the intercultural factors and strategies which should be followed in order to achieve a successful communication (Kondo, Tebble, Alexieva, & Dam, 1997; Fisher, Ury & Patton, 2011). Although, it is already proven that intercultural communication is related to win or failure in the negotiation framework (Adair & Brett, 2004), it is interesting to examine how culture influences the negotiation outcome regarding different negotiation strategies.

General study findings suggest considering the cognitive behavior, as well as, social, emotional and language factors involved in negotiating. Basic study patterns are still implemented in the research environment, in order to set the fundamental theoretical background. Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1991) propose four principles of negotiation strategies, which are: separating people from the problem, focusing on interests not positions, contriving choices for mutual gain, and persisting on objective criteria. This study of Fisher et al. (1991) discussed negotiation in the context of negotiation preparation settings instead of the negotiation strategies implemented during the actual process. My study is focused on the negotiation process itself.

Hofstede (2001), the father of intercultural studies in the majority of his work, regards the cultural effect as the catalyst of the culture on the communication by identification of national culture dimensions. Kondo et al. (1997), claim that factors such as, behavior (rituals and customs) and an individuals’ culture’s negotiating strategy are involved in intercultural communication, what affects individuals’ intercultural awareness later and therefore the negotiation process itself. For instance, if the individuals’ culture is characterized by expression of passion during the communication process this individual will express his/her emotions during the negotiation process more easily. This could have positive or negative consequences, depending on the negotiation settings and the involved cultural backgrounds. If communicators do not agree with the propositions of the other party, they are more likely
to express their dissatisfaction and a conflict is more likely to occur. On the other hand, if the negotiator consents with the other party’s propositions he/she will complacence and the negotiation could yield better performance. This is in line with Pinkley and Northcraft (1994) research findings that cognitive frameworks could be impactful not only for the content of the agreements, but also for the outcomes of the negotiations. Ethics, customs, perceptions and negotiators’ behaviour of each culture are different and could have an important effect on the negotiation performance within intercultural communication framework, as communicators are characterized by human nature. It’s important to mention these core studies in order to efficiently understand the negotiation strategies concept within the intercultural business environment.

Nowadays, the most recent research findings which are based on the aforementioned core studies, associate the effect of emotions in the negotiation process with cultural differences. Recent research findings associate the effect of emotions in the negotiation process with cultural differences (Druckman & Olekalns, 2008; Elfenbein, 2007; Kopelman & Rosette, 2008; Ogliastri & Quintanilla, 2016). A consistent finding in negotiation research is that both success and failure of any strategy in the bargaining process is partly determined by the social context (Weingart & Olekalns, 2004). Furthermore, conflict resolution tactic, which is part of the integrative negotiation style, is found to be effective in solving the language cultural biased conflicts, via provisional restructuring (Rossini, 2011). This strategy has shown promising results in conflict mitigation and should be further examined for the sake of developing a unified negotiation theory (2011). Therefore, because of cultural differences, communicators have to wisely select their negotiation strategy and tactics without neglecting the emotional factor.

However no empirical research has been conducted specifically concerning negotiation strategies, related to the external communicators’ negotiation performance in the framework of intercultural awareness. This directly affects the framework of the communication process. There seems to be a gap in the literature considering the actual effectiveness of negotiation strategies on communicators’ negotiation performance and the influence of a communicator’s intercultural awareness level. This fact has not been addressed by the effectiveness spectrum related to the intercultural negotiation performance (Imai & Gelfand, 2010). This gap not only concerns the concept of global management (from the organization’s perspective) but also global mobilization and action (from the stakeholder’s
perspective) considering intercultural differences. Furthermore, practitioners could implement the findings of this study in order to ameliorate the performance of the organization. Organizations can provide communicators with a proper intercultural training since it is important for the globalized business environment, where communicators are expected to bring their best strategies and tactics in order to deal with the other communicators. External communicators should be able to analyze an audience under different circumstances and understand the cross-cultural differences in order to create a communication strategy that facilitates the achievement of the organization’s communication objectives (Barrett, 2006). Organizations provide external communicators with the appropriate knowledge of the upcoming negotiated issue and the exact settled goals before the actual negotiation, where the external communicator’s skills will support the preparation: “good preparation allows you to strategize and to think on your feet in the negotiation room” (Jetley, 2016), aiming to communicate effectively, practitioners enable negotiation strategies. Specifically, training programs based on the academical insights concern negotiation strategies and their outcomes, will provide more relevant results.

According to the aforementioned theory the following research question will be examined:

**RQ**: To what extent do negotiation communication strategies of organizations influence the external communicators’ negotiation performance and to what extent is this relationship influenced by intercultural awareness?

**Theoretical framework**

**Negotiation Strategies**

Communication is a strategic integrating mechanism proven to promote cooperative conflict resolution behaviors and positively affect the firm ability for effective interaction (Koza, 1999; Mohr, Fisher, & Nevin, 1996; Mohr & Spekman, 1994; Sinickas, 2001). Thus, a negotiation procedure needs effective communication in order to produce desirable outcomes. According to Ogliastri and Quintanilla (2016, p. 452), within the communication framework a negotiation, “occurs in a situation in which two or more parties have conflicting interests, but also have a zone of mutual understanding where differences can be resolved. The parties prefer to resolve the conflict through a mutual agreement instead of resorting to force or a trial.”.
Initially, negotiation behavior is often described in terms of different strategies (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). According to Odell (2002, 2003), negotiation strategies are an integral part of the process of negotiation, which encapsulates a series of actions with some stability through time, where parties discuss demands and proposals from one party to another with the avowed purpose of reaching an agreement and shift the behavior of at least one actor. Strategy is made up by distinct actions that are called tactics. A strategy could remain fixed for the duration of a bargaining episode, or it could be modified overall (Odell, 2002). Any strategy will have to be fixed to the peculiarities of the situation at hand and ideally, a strategy will not employ the same tactics in different applications (2002). As a result, it's not possible for a strategy to address every plausible response for all the different possibilities.


**Integrative strategy.** The integrative strategy can be regarded as a “bargaining” strategy which when utilized by practitioners results in alternative results than what was originally intended. (Perdue & Summers, 1991). For this specific research, the term integrative strategy is preferred to be used, because it is perceived as the most widespread term to describe this strategy. Some researchers (Perdue & Summers, 1991; Odell, 2002; Olekans & Smith, 2013; Zacchilli, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2009) used the definitions: value-creating, problem-solving, compromising, coordination and affiliation strategy, which are in line with the integrative strategy. Value creation and shared accommodation is supported by this strategy in the sense that the integrative cluster contains methods tailored to the distribution of the negotiation process information. (Olekalns & Smith, 2013). Integrative strategy encompasses tactics which are implemented in negotiations aiming at consensus and allot the same interests (Thomas, 1976).

**Distributive strategy.** The distributive (namely competitive or value-claiming by Loewenstein, Morris, Chakravarti, Thompson, & Kopelman, 2005) strategy cluster involves tactics meant to convince and at the same time question the other negotiator’s appraisal of
what is achievable (Olekalns & Smith, 2013). In the case of a “low concern” towards the opponents’ interests, distributive strategy will be preferred (Ness & Haugland, 2005). Specifically, when a party is not interested in creating a common ground, communicators indicate “low concern” about the other party. The target of the distributive strategy is to win a zero-sum game (Zohar, 2015). This adversarial style demands tough tactics such as, determination, well-tuned aggressiveness, decisiveness, involving decision-making abilities to take a risk (2015). Negotiators requirements are self-confidence to preserve high aspirations to accomplish the organization goal.

**Negotiation performance**

Scholars support that different handling in the international negotiation process affects outcomes (Odell, 2003). The negotiation outcome is defined by Odell (2003, p.46), as "whether the interaction ended in agreement or deadlock, and how much was gained or lost by each party and by the group of parties as a whole.". Outcomes could be evaluated in comparison to their efficiency and stability (Hopmann, 1996). The amount of gains and losses of a negotiator are understood by referencing the existing conditions prior to the talks. Is the party going to gain, lose or stay in the same levels as before the talk? (Olden, 2003).

Furthermore, since external factors can affect the negotiation strategy chosen by the negotiators, they in turn are expected to choose a strategy suited for the specific negotiation (Sanchez-Anguix, Inglada, Botti, & Garcia-Fornes, 2013). The negotiation strategy and tactics selected, strongly depend on environmental factors and have a pivotal effect on the negotiation performance (2013). For instance, when communicators carefully examine the environmental factors before the expected negotiation, they are able to employ an effective for the circumstances negotiation strategy and be well-prepared, in order to increase their chances of achieving the defined goal. Pistone (2007) supported that the selection of the negotiation strategy determines the successfulness of the attorney negotiator’s outcome. The choice of the strategy and tactics depends on the negotiation settings and could change during the negotiation process between the parties, since nobody could predict precisely the flow of the negotiation. The competitive behavior for the completion of one party’s goal which is characterized by the distributive dimension (Gulliver, 1979; Lax & Sebenius, 1986).

However, the negotiation strategy could be enhanced in the case of a suitable combination of the distinctives styles (Zohar, 2015).
Negotiation strategies influencing the performance

In this research I propose that negotiation strategies have an influence on the external communicators’ negotiation performance. The negotiation outcome could meet the expectation or not, and it depends on the communicators’ applied integrative or distributive strategies and tactics. This general assumption is supported by Perdue and Summers (1991) theory. Specifically, they supported that variables such as cooperative orientation, cost sensitivity, uniqueness of specification and formal planning, problem solving, manipulating, and implementing tough tactics are placed within the negotiation process. It was discovered that integrative and distributive strategies could be applied to enhance or lessen the content of any set of negotiations. (Perdue & Summers, 1991, p. 186). Thus, communicators’ selected strategies are impactful for their negotiation performance. Furthermore, research has shown that the individuals’ personality affects task performance on the job (Thompson, Payne, Horner, & Morey, 2012). Individuals driven by cooperative orientation tend to exchange information and provide support to each other (Zohar, 2015), while individuals characterized by conflictive orientation during team work request heterogeneous profit from the relationship (Zohar, 2015). Therefore is assumed that integrative negotiation strategy has more positive influence on the performance outcome that the distributive strategy.

Integrative strategy is more positively impactful for the performance outcome because when communicators employ cooperative tactics, parties could easier understand the involved interests and solve the problem or come to an agreement. This supported by Gulliver (1979), and Lax and Sebenius (1986), as cooperative behavior which is of paramount importance for coordinating mutual agreements, characterized by the integrative dimension, during under pressure negotiation settings. In addition, through empirical findings it is presented that a gradual understanding of the relational roles of each party could be used to seek a conflict harmonization (Ness & Haugland, 2003). Previous research investigated the negotiation strategies in terms of effective negotiation performance and proved that in the case of individuals’ preferences similarity or implementation of a rational concession, the performance results are high (Sanchez-Anguix et al., 2013; Padney, Kummar, & Tiwari, 2017). Thus, when the negotiation parties share similarities and common characteristics the agreement is easier to be reached. Trust and collegial behavior can also arise in liasons with a known end-point (Ness & Haugland, 2003). Therefore, negotiation members attempt to work
together effectively by implementing integrative techniques as they share mutual interests and expectations.

The integrative strategy promotes a cooperative style, and enable tactics based on fairness, building relationship process, while promoting fruitful solutions for the involved parties through the collection and sharing of information (Pistone, 2007). Sharing information tactic is a significant part of integrative strategy and of a crucial importance for successful negotiation. It helps communicators to develop a useful image of the other party, accept easier the proposed solutions and build relations based on trust among them. There are researches that support this view. Ness and Haugland (2003) support that information sharing is enhanced by the level of trust, which is thought to be imperative in problem-solving negotiation development (2003). Also, the amount of trust and control, both jointly and independently play their part in building up the confidence in partner cooperation (Das & Teng, 1998). The idea of confidence could potentially prove of paramount importance in understanding both structural and behavioral aspects of fixed-duration relationships (Ness & Haugland, 2003). Additionally, information gathering is an essential uncertainty reduction strategy that negotiators embrace (Mohr et al. 1996; Mohr & Spekman 1994), and communication offers the way of passing knowledge along communicators. As a result, communication may be thought of in its strategic sense in terms of its implications for the relationship in the case of sharing against restricting information (Koza & Dant, 2006).

According to Sinickas (2001) the research conducted by the University of Michigan, showed that information-sharing tactics helps the parties to obtain facts about the other, develop a more personalized relationship, and retrieve ameliorated negotiation outcomes. In this survey it is demonstrated that “during the course of five years, companies with higher scores on information-sharing had higher return on investment and higher return on sales than companies with lower scores” (2001). Given that information-sharing tactic affects the company’s revenue, the performance of the conducted negotiation is improved. So, communicators featuring a great aspiration to cooperate, will aim to establish integration mechanisms that facilitate effective interaction, and therefore granting a higher probability of success (Carson, Madhok, Varman, & John, 2003; Koza 1995; Mohr & Spekman 1994). Furthermore, member performance is partly determined by the used strategy within a relationship that enables partners to effectively address issues (Koza & Dant, 2006), and for
this reason it’s important for a successful negotiation to share information and communicate effectively.

Parties implement integrative and distributive strategies and tactics in order to control the negotiation outcome. It is assumed that distributive negotiation strategy and the corresponding tough tactics have more negative influence on the performance, as communicators using the distributive strategy do not share information and are not willing to cooperate to reach an agreement beneficial for all parties. In defiance of the common nature of negotiation in social interactions, it is common for an individual to fail in attaining results advantageous to both parties (Olekalns & Smith, 2013). This failure is most plausible to arise when negotiators implement distributive strategy attempting to ameliorate their respective outcomes at the cost of their adversaries outcomes (2013). When communicators enable distributive tactics which include threats, it is difficult to develop a common ground and achieve positive negotiation outcomes. The absence of information leads to distrust among communicators. Therefore, to establish a beneficial relationship for both parties, participants shouldn’t keep an eye out primarily for their own personal outcomes (Corfman & Lehmann, 1993). When a solution is found, by the respective negotiator that addresses critical needs and interests of both parties, a common ground is created (Olekalns & Smith, 2013). This is achievable when dissimilarities or contrasts arise in the respective negotiators inclinations along with the merit assigned to the negotiable items (Lax & Sebenius, 1986).

Therefore, according to the aforementioned literature the following hypothesis is suggested in order to empirically examine the actual effect of both negotiation strategies on the negotiation performance outcome:

**H1:** The relation between the organization’s integrative negotiation strategy and the external communicators’ negotiation performance is more positive compared to distributive negotiation strategy.

**Intercultural awareness**

Intercultural awareness is perceived as an extension of the aforementioned cultural awareness. Particularly its adjusted to the needs of intercultural communication as it is essential for the development of a productive relationship and promotes effective communication in the globalized environment (Baker, 2011; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). In the interconnected and globalized world, intercultural awareness has a significant impact
on managers and their workplace performance as they are challenged to interact and share a workplace with individuals who are characterized by different values and ethics (Townsend & Cairns, 2003). It is claimed by Landers (2017) that global business demands communicators that are well prepared and are able to avoid the “culture crush” phenomenon, because “people’s money and information flies faster than ever across international borders”. Thus, negotiation is a privileged tool, used by managers to solve collisions, reach an agreement and avoid conflicts (Thompson, 1990).

Intercultural communication understanding is represented by the meaning of intercultural awareness that concerns culture customs that influence the behavior and individuals thinking procedure (Chen & Starosta, 1998). The concept definition term is varied by different researchers, while the meaning is the same. Chen and Starosta (2000), propose the concept of intercultural sensitivity which refers to the individual's’ motivation to understand and appreciate and accept other cultures. For this exact research the use of the term intercultural awareness was chosen, as it is the most popular term implemented within negotiation framework in the intercultural studies related to the organizational business environment. The concept of the intercultural sensitivity is similar to intercultural awareness, and because this scale measurement was found as the most accurate one to measure properly the intercultural awareness, within the negotiation framework, this scale was employed.

Chen and Starosta (2000) attempted to develop the concept and tested all its aspects. As a result, they extracted five indicators: interaction engagement, respect of cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment and interaction attentiveness. These sub-concepts are proposed to explain the intercultural sensitivity and help us properly describe the similar concept of intercultural awareness. Interaction engagement referred to the individuals’ “feeling of participation in intercultural communication”; Respect of cultural differences indicate how individuals “orient to or tolerate their counterparts’ culture and opinion”; Interaction confidence is explained as the level of individuals’ confidence in the intercultural setting; individuals’ “positive or negative reactions toward communicating with people from different cultures” explain the sub-concept of the interaction enjoyment. The last sub-concept, namely interaction attentiveness explains individuals’ “effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction”.

The above-mentioned sub-concepts are used in this research to understand minutely the concept of intercultural awareness.
Intercultural awareness as moderating factor

In this study I propose that communicators’ intercultural awareness level has an influence on the relationship between the integrative negotiation strategy and the performance outcome. When communicators have a high level of intercultural awareness they tend to implement more the integrative strategy, as they are more open-minded, they use information-sharing tactics and they are able to listen propositions of the other party, which could have a different cultural background. Therefore, the negotiation performance outcome is more positive compared to communicators who do not indicate high intercultural awareness and would not easily accept the proposition and concerns of the other party. This is in line with the theory that supports that each party performs the most beneficial negotiation strategy to accomplish its goal (Ness & Haugland, 2005; Zohar, 2015).

Furthermore, the level of concern for the opponent’s interests determines the parties’ strategic choice (Ness & Haugland, 2005), for example, when the negotiation goals are similar for both parties and communicators are interculturally aware, we assume that most of the enabled tactics will be part of integrative strategy, as communicators want to finalize the negotiation as soon as possible and met their goals (win-win situation). Thus, cross-cultural training provides negotiators with abilities of critical thinking and implement the suitable strategies and tactics in order to achieve the adorable negotiation outcome (Landers, 2017).

According to the aforementioned theory the following hypothesis is suggested:

**H2**: The positive relationship between the organization’s integrative negotiation strategy and the external communicators’ negotiation performance is stronger for practitioners with higher intercultural awareness level than with lower.

Research Method

In order to carry out this research, a quantitative method was assumed to be the most suitable for this particular case to investigate precisely the negotiation strategies used by communicators related to the performance outcomes, and the influence of intercultural awareness to this relation. A cross-sectional online survey was conducted. The reason for choosing this research design is that it allows researchers to create a self-administered questionnaire for communicators so that all of the concepts could be measured properly. Additionally, the fact that questionnaires could be administered almost everywhere embedded in emails gives us the advantage of collecting quickly a large amount of data and low in cost
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(Bryman, 2016). Findings of this particular research could be more reliable as the respondents will not be biased due to the personal interview, and will have high ecological validity (2016).

**Sampling**

The procedure is composed from the combination of two sampling methods. The convenience sampling and snowball sampling in order to reach as many participants as we can and at the same time, render the sample representative. Specifically, given that the target population were communicators from different organizations, I used convenience sampling. This method is made up of people who were easy to reach. My personal network was used because it is suitable for a widely dispersed sample, intend to gather a sample of managers from different countries. It was important to assemble communicators from different countries and cultural backgrounds, considering that this research included the examination of the influence of cultural effect during negotiations among stakeholders in the international business arena.

Additionally, a snowball sampling was applied for the convenience of this research. As the purpose of the research was to reach external communicators, who are not an easily accessible population, I contacted via LinkedIn the communicators already existing in contacts. Then, after the completion of the questionnaire, they were kindly requested to share the survey with other individuals of the same position. This method provide us with a larger sample easily and efficiently.

The questionnaires were designed with the help of online Survey Software Qualtrics.

**Respondents and procedure**

Respondents were instructed to complete an online self-completion questionnaire. All of the respondents completed the questionnaire \( N=52 \). The proportion of biological sex was 59.6% males and 40.4% females, from 23 to 56 years old \( M=34.52, SD=9.31 \). Most of the respondents were residents of European continent (Figure 1) and had obtained a Master’s (50%) and a Bachelor’s (34,6%) degree (see Appendix C).

At first, a short introduction about the purpose of the research was included and the individual respondents’ anonymity was assured. Second, researchers’ personal details were provided in order to engage the participants in the importance of this study and consent to complete the questionnaire. At the end of the page, respondents were asked to “click” whether they agree to participate or not before proceeding with the questionnaire. Not only
respondents were provided with clear and explicit instructions before the completion of the questionnaire but also, they would be able to use a contact email after the completion, in case there were any queries about the procedure.

![Country of residence](image)

*Figure 1. Country of residence.*

**Measures**

**Basic Information.** The concepts of this particular study are latent. Therefore, I used indicator-items in order to measure the variables properly. All perceptual measures were anchored using 7-point Likert scales. Gathering data from self-report perceptual measures provided insights on the overall negotiation performance of communicators. The use of these items yielded a “holistic” picture of how distributive and integrative strategies are related to the performance and the intercultural awareness influence on this relationship.

**Negotiation strategies.** For the purpose of this particular research a combination of two already existed scales were implemented.
**Integrative strategy.** The integrative negotiating style measurement scale was introduced by Cheung et al. (2006). The adopted scale consists of 12-items, which were the most suitable intend to measure the integrative strategy, measured on a seven-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 7=strongly disagree), (See Appendix A.1). For the convenience of this research 12 items, which measure the integrative negotiation strategy, were recoded (reversion). Therefore, afterwards the higher values indicated positive results (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Then, the reliability of the scale was tested, which is high, Cronbach’s Alpha = .92. Afterwards, a new variable was computed, namely, integrative strategy, \(M= 5.42, SD= .97\).

**Distributive strategy.** The distributive behavior measurement scale was proposed by Koza and Dant (2006). All 8-items of the existing scale were adopted and measured it on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 7=strongly disagree) instead of 5-point proposed in the existing scale, to constitute the results more precise (See Appendix A.1). Similarly, for the convenience of the study 8 items, which measure the distributive negotiation strategy were recoded (reversion), so afterwards values indicated 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree. The reliability of the tested scale was high, Cronbach’s Alpha = .92. Afterwards, a new variable was computed, namely, distributive strategy, \(M= 3.63, SD= 1.32\).

These modified scales were suitable for this research because I intended to measure only the integrative and distributive negotiation strategies and avoid the confusion of the measurement of different styles of negotiation. The questionnaire included items instructed the participants to indicate their degree of agreement to the statements related to their recent negotiation procedure.

**Negotiation performance outcome.** In order to measure this concept, the already tested scale introduced by Cheung et al. (2006) was adopted to avoid errors and ensure the reliability and validity of items. The scale consists of 21-items, measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 7=strongly disagree). The participants were instructed to indicate their agreement to the statement related to their recent negotiation performance outcome for organization, where they are occupied (See Appendix A.2).

For the convenience of the research 7 items were recoded to achieve homogeneity of the scale (reversion): “The solution found, satisfied the goals and needs of both parties”, “An optimal and creative solution to the problem was found”, “Relationship between the parties was kept intact for future interaction”, “Less conflict-leaden environment was produced”,


“More behavioral compliance with both parties was achieved”, “The levels of conflict were reduced”, “Less future disputes were likely made”. Thus, afterwards the higher values indicated positive results (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Then, a reliability analysis of the scale was conducted, which was high, Cronbach’s Alpha = .91. Afterwards, a new variable was computed, namely; Negotiation performance, ($M=4.7$, $SD=.88$).

**Intercultural awareness.** In order to ensure the validity and reliability of the measurement tool, an existing and tested scale, proposed by Chen and Starosta (2000), will be adopted and slightly modified to constitute the measurement of “Intercultural awareness” concept more precise and suitable for this research. I decided to exclude one item from the proposed scale as it was not highly relevant for the research: “I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction”. The latter item, given that this research is conducted within the negotiation framework, would not provide us with relevant information. Regarding the negotiation procedure the intercultural awareness level could not be measured by positive or negative responses among communicators because the negative or positive answers are determined by the given situation. This latent concept was measured with the help of five main indicators measured by 22-items concern individuals’ perception towards statements related to culture: interaction engagement, respect of cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment and interaction attractiveness. The scale was anchored using 7-point Likert scale, instead of 5-point intend to render the results more specific (See Appendix A.3).

For the purpose of this research, all items were recoded to achieve homogeneity of the scale (reversion). Therefore, afterwards the higher values indicated positive results (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Then, the reliability of the scale was tested, which was high, Cronbach’s Alpha = .91, even higher than the previous reliability of the scale, after the exclusion of the one proposed item (Cronbach’s Alpha = .86). Afterwards, a new variable was computed, namely, intercultural awareness, ($M=5.3$, $SD=.87$).

For the full information provided on the scales, see Appendix A.

**Analysis**

To test the main effect of H1, multiple regression analysis was performed. For H1 I wanted to examine whether there is a positive relation between integrative negotiation strategy use compared to distributive negotiation strategy (as independent variables) and the negotiation performance (as a dependent variable). Then, to examine H2, if the positive
relationship between integrative negotiation strategy and the communicators’ negotiation performance is stronger for individuals with higher intercultural awareness level, a multiple linear regression was conducted. The regression analysis was performed with the PROCESS model 1 analysis.

Throughout the analyses for hypotheses 1 and 2, the variable integrative strategy was used as the independent variable for the multiple regression analyses, similarly for hypotheses 1 and 2 negotiation performance variable was used as the dependent variable. For the hypothesis 1 the variable distributive strategy was used as an additional independent variable. For hypothesis 2 the variable intercultural awareness was used as the moderator variable. The assumptions of normally distributed and homoscedastic residuals, had been met (Figure 2; Figure 3; see Appendix B). The results of the performed analysis are presented in the following results section.

Figure 2. Regression residuals distribution.
Figure 3. Regression scatterplot.

Results

H1: The regression model with the negotiation performance as a dependent variable, and integrative negotiation and distributive negotiation strategies as independent variables is significant, $F(2, 49) = 20.782, p<.001$. The regression model can therefore be used to predict negotiation performance, and the strength of the prediction is high: 46 per cent of the variation in negotiation performance can be predicted on the basis of integrative and distributive negotiation strategies ($R^2 = .46$). Integrative strategy, $b^* = 0.44, t = 3.48, p=.001, 95\% CI [0.17, 0.64]$ and distributive strategy, $b^* = -0.33, t = -2.59, p<.05, 95\% CI [-0.39, -0.05]$, have a significant, strong association with negotiation performance. Thus, integrative strategy has a stronger influence on performance outcome than distributive strategy. Individuals who scored higher to the integrative strategy scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) have significantly higher negotiation performance, while individuals who scored higher to the distributive strategy scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) have significantly lower negotiation outcome. Therefore, H1 is supported.
Table 1.
Regression analysis summary for integrative strategy and distributive strategy predicting negotiation performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrative strategy</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive strategy</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H2**: I run the analysis on PROCESS model 1, in order to test the moderation effect of the intercultural awareness on the positive relationship of integrative negotiation strategy on negotiation performance (tested on H1). Overall the model is significant, $F(3, 48)= 37.80$, $p<.001$, $R^2 =.70$, and 70 per cent of the variation in negotiation performance can be predicted. Integrative strategy did not significantly predict the negotiation performance when the model includes intercultural awareness, while intercultural awareness is a significant predictor for negotiation performance $b^* = 0.74$, $t = 6.47$, $p<.001$. For every unit increase in individual’s intercultural awareness level, the negotiation performance increases by 0.74. The interaction effect was not significant, thus no main effect of intercultural awareness on the relationship was found. Therefore, H2 is not supported.

However, because a main effect of intercultural awareness on the negotiation performance (dependent variable) was found, one additional analysis on PROCESS model 4 was performed in order to investigate if intercultural awareness mediates the relationship between the integrative negotiation strategy and negotiation performance. Results indicated that the integrative strategy is a significant predictor of intercultural awareness, $b^* = .60$, $t = 6.40$, $p < .001$, and that intercultural awareness is a significant predictor of negotiation performance, $b^* = .77$, $t = 7.11$, $p < .001$. These results provided support for the mediation.
Integrative strategy was no longer a significant predictor of the negotiation performance after controlling for the mediator (full mediation), intercultural awareness. Approximately 70% of
the variance in negotiation performance was accounted for by the predictors, $R^2 = .70$. The indirect effect was tested using a percentile bootstrap estimation approach, implemented with the PROCESS Version 3.2.01 (Hayes, 2018). These results indicated the indirect coefficient was significant, $b^* = .47$, $SE = .10$, 95% CI [0.25, 0.64]. The integrative negotiation strategy use was associated with performance scores that were approximately .47 points higher as mediated by individuals’ intercultural awareness level.

**Discussion**

The aim of this study was to investigate how negotiation communication strategies of organizations influence the external communicators’ negotiation performance and how this could be affected by intercultural awareness. The results provided insights into the impactfulness of the integrative and distributive negotiation strategies implementation on the negotiation performance outcome. Furthermore, findings showed that intercultural awareness mediates the relationship between integrative negotiation strategy and the performance outcome.

The first hypothesis proposed that the relation between the organization’s integrative negotiation strategy and communicators’ negotiation performance is more positive compared to the distributive negotiation strategy. The assumption was supported by significant results. Communicators implement different negotiation strategies for the performance outcome controlling. Specifically, the results revealed that not only the integrative negotiation strategy has a more positive influence on the negotiation performance outcome than the distributive strategy, but that distributive strategy is associated with negative performance outcome, particularly communicators, who make use of distributive tactics, such as threats, failed to achieve a fruitful negotiation outcome. These findings are in line with Odell’s (2003) predictions that normally, the handling in the negotiation process has an effect on the performance outcome. When both parties address their common interests, they are able to find a common ground, contrary when each of the parties propose their self-needs communicators tend to fail (Olekans & Smith, 2013). The use of integrative strategy and tactics have positive results when the negotiation takes place between people who share similar cultural backgrounds. For instance communicators from the same country are more willing to understand and accept the propositions of the other party, which facilitate the common ground stipulation.
This is in line with the fact that communicators develop trust and common ground by information sharing (Mohr et al., 1996; Pistone, 2007) which is responsible for creating a beneficial relationship between parties (Corfman & Lehmann, 1993). Communicators who used tactics such as “give and take”, compromising and were trying to find a solution which satisfies both parties achieved higher performance results than communicators who used “take it or leave it” tactics and refused to cooperate with the other party for achieving the common interest. As a result, gradual understanding leads to harmonized relations (Ness & Haugland, 2003) and communicators achieve this by implementing integrative techniques (Zohar, 2015), which results in more positive negotiation performance.

Regarding the second hypothesis, based on the fact the cultural diversity influences the communication process (Aytemiz Seymen, 2006), it is assumed that the positive relationship between the organization’s integrative negotiation strategy and the external communicators’ negotiation performance is stronger for individuals with higher intercultural awareness level. Although, intercultural awareness promotes effective communication (Baker, 2011; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005), and has an effect on negotiating strategy employment for business accomplishing (Kondo et al., 1997; Olekalns & Smith, 2013), the moderation hypothesis did not find support. However, intercultural awareness effect found to be impactful for the negotiation performance outcome. Therefore, practitioners with high intercultural awareness level have a better negotiation performance outcome when interacting within the international business arena. This is in line with the Van Woerkom and De Reuver (2009), theory that cultural diversity has an effect on communicators performance outcome. An alternative explanation for the non significant moderation is the limited sample size. Individuals’ projected high level of intercultural awareness, but not much variation was found among respondents ($M= 5.3, SD=.87$), as most of the respondents were from different countries in Europe, thus sharing some common european culture characteristics. Thus, if this study is replicated with a distinct and substantial number of respondents, moderation could be supported.

Unexpectedly, because of the intercultural awareness effect on the performance outcome, I found support for the mediation assumption that the relationship between integrative negotiation strategy and the performance outcome is mediated by practitioners’ intercultural awareness level. The mediating role of intercultural awareness finds support in Pinkley and Northcraft (1994) theory, and enhanced by Landers (2017), that the cultural
framework affect the outcomes of negotiation. Therefore, communicators’ with different levels of intercultural awareness, implementing integrative strategy and its tactics, indicate diverse negotiation performance outcome. Surprisingly, the findings projected that when this relationship is mediated by the intercultural awareness, integrative negotiation strategy does not significantly influence the negotiation performance outcome (the direct effect is disappeared). A rational explanation of these findings is that, when the intercultural awareness concept is involved, the integration strategy implementation does not result in more positive performance outcome because, the cultural factor is the most impactful one. This is supported by Kondo et al. theory, as the way individuals negotiate depends on their cultural background, “In one culture’s negotiating strategy, direct business matters may precede the build up of a mutual rapport, while in another, the process may start indirectly and slowly lead to the actual business to be accomplished” (1997, p. 151). Cultural diversity is an important factor influencing the communication process of the organizations (Aytemiz Seymen, 2006) and communicators performance (Van Woerkom & De Reuver, 2009). Therefore, intercultural understanding leads to effective communication and prevents miscommunication during the negotiation process.

Furthermore, individuals’ intercultural awareness could be obtained by the proper training process (Chen & Starosta, 2000; Seufert, 2002), and at the same time could be developed as a personal characteristic if a person grows up in an intercultural environment. Thus, the implementation of the integrative negotiation strategy could not control the negotiation outcome when practitioners are characterized by high intercultural awareness level. However, Barrett (2006) and, Ness and Haugland (2005) emphasize the impactful role of the strategy choice, while Cheung et al. (2006) and Zohar (2015) demonstrate the importance of integrative negotiation strategy to reach an optimal agreement.

**Practical and scientific implications**

Firstly, the current study provides insights in practitioners’ negotiation performance considering the execution of the two main negotiation strategies, integrative and distributive strategy. Secondly, I investigated the influential role of practitioners’ intercultural awareness level on the negotiation performance outcome when enabling the integrative strategy. The findings can be implemented not only by external communication professionals, such as corporate communication and marketing communication specialists but also, by every practitioner who is involved in the communication and particularly in the negotiation process.
The study showed two important insights. First, the integrative negotiation strategy has a significant influence on the negotiation performance outcome compared to distributive strategy only when the communicators’ intercultural awareness level is not taken under consideration. Second, the relation between execution of the integrative negotiation strategy and the performance outcome is explained by practitioners’ intercultural awareness level. The intercultural awareness factor presence eradicates the integrative strategy influence on the negotiation performance. Therefore, organizations and practitioners should invest in cross-cultural training, because it is the most important factor for controlling the negotiation performance within the multicultural business arena.

From a scientific point of view, nowadays, due to the multinational environment of business, most of the practitioners originating from the organizational framework spectrum come up with the necessity to be present in the negotiation procedure to achieve an organizational goal (Landers, 2017). Furthermore, Fang (2010), puts emphasis on the Hofstede dominant “paradigm” of the culture on cross-cultural management. Stakeholders, specifically practitioners are expected to be prepared in order to defend their interests and achieve their organizational goals (Okoro, 2012; Townsend & Cairns, 2003). Thus, they should be able to analyze the current negotiation settings and consider the cross-cultural diversity (Johnson et al., 2006), to employ strategies which provoke the expected organization’s results.

The most important implication for scientific research is that, the findings confirmed that nowadays, we cannot examine the performance within the negotiation framework without taking into consideration the intercultural awareness, as a full mediation was found. According to Ochieng and Price (2010) communications within multicultural venture environments could be efficient when project communicators demonstrate a compelling level of intercultural awareness. Within multicultural cities where people are diverse, the development of intercultural awareness during an individual's’ life is inevitable.

**Limitations**

Firstly, the most important limitation for this particular research is the sample size of 52 practitioners. Although, the respondents were all from the relevant field of communication and some of them are holding managerial positions which are highly involved in the negotiation process, the sample size could be a limitation as the responses could vary if the individuals were others practitioners. Their negotiation procedures and experience could be
different and project diverse negotiation performance outcomes. Additionally, most of the participants are residents of European countries, so the results could be biased. However, a potential moderator could be the cultural background concept.

Secondly, the moderation assumption was not supported in this research, but I maintain strong beliefs, based on previous literature, that a limitation could be the sample size and the questionnaire type, as the participants were indicated to choose between different tactics of the integrative and the distributive strategy in the survey. Additionally, a selected strategy could remain consistent throughout the bargaining process, or practitioners may alter the strategy during the negotiation. Thus, practitioners adjust strategies to achieve mutual understanding during intercultural communication (Odell, 2002). Therefore, different negotiation settings could provoke and different results could be reflected from other respondents, if they enabled a combination of strategies during the negotiation procedure.

Lastly, considering the previous literature, Putnam (1990) and Zohar (2015) propose that the harmonization of both strategies, integrative and distributive are necessary for the negotiation process, “integrative and distributive processes are intertwined in a symbiotic bonding that pervades negotiations” (Putnam, 1990, p. 5). In contrast, current findings support that the implementation of integrative strategy during negotiation ameliorates the performance outcome compared to the use of distributive negotiation strategy. Similarly, according to Perdue and Summers (1991), integrative and distributive negotiation strategies could be both employed by practitioners in any given negotiation. Particularly, when one of the communicators is driven by different goals from the opponent’s goals, the implemented distributive strategy or combination of both negotiation strategies, will produce a different negotiation outcome (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Therefore, the goal of the negotiation should be taken into consideration, as it could determine the strategy employment.

**Future Research**

The current study demonstrated that integrative negotiation strategy has an influence on the negotiation performance outcome in comparison with distributive strategy, and that the relation between implementation of the integrative strategy and the negotiation performance outcome is mediated by practitioners’ intercultural awareness level. In future research it would be interesting to replicate the study to see if the results will remain similar with different respondents, from different residency or whether the moderation effect I expected
will be reflected by new results. Also, it would be interesting to examine the current study relationships and moderation effect by applying experimental design to prove the causality.

Findings of the study also showed that when the positive relationship between the integrative strategy and negotiation performance is mediated by the intercultural awareness, integrative strategy significantly loses influence over the negotiation performance outcome. Thus, a future study should examine how cultural awareness could predict the selection of integrative strategy, which in turn affects the negotiation performance outcome. New relationship results can be proven to be of importance for practical and managerial implications.

Furthermore, the negotiation framework probably contains significant information regarding each negotiator’s power and status that influences the strategies that negotiators prefer (Olekalns & Smith, 2013). Thus, research should examine the moderation effect of power and status on the negotiation procedure and performance outcome with intercultural communication settings. Finally, future research can investigate the practitioners’ implementation of integrative and distributive strategies by a certain geographical region, such as the emerging Asian or Latin American business environment from the organization’s perspective. These findings can provide specific and more accurate insights about the negotiation strategic choices, which can ameliorate practitioners knowledge and therefore negotiation performance.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A

1. Negotiation Strategies

Consider a recent negotiation to settle a construction dispute, evaluate the degree of agreeableness of the statements in relation to the negotiating behavior taken by you. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)

(integrative strategy)
Q1.1 I collaborated with the other to come up with decision acceptable to us.
Q1.2 I tried to bring all concerns out in the open so that the issues could be resolved in the best possible way.
Q1.3 I exchanged accurate information with the other so that we could solve the problem together.
Q1.4 I tried to work with the other to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.
Q1.5 I tried to investigate an issue with the other to find a solution that would be acceptable to everyone involved.
Q1.6 I tried to work with the other for a proper understanding of a problem.
Q1.7 I tried to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.
Q1.8 I proposed a middle ground to break deadlocks.
Q1.9 I negotiated with the other so that compromise could be reached.
Q1.10 I tried to integrate my ideas with the other to come up with a decision jointly.
Q1.11 I used “give and take” so that a compromise could be reached.
Q1.12 I tried to avoid unpleasant exchanges with the other.

(distributive strategy)
Q1.13 I used convincing arguments to achieve our own end.
Q1.14 I was committed to my initial position throughout the negotiation process.
Q1.15 I tried to create the impression that there is nothing the other part could do to change the terms of my position.
Q1.16 I tried to insist on my position because its the best alternative to solve the dispute.
Q1.17 I used "take it or leave it" tactic in case the other party refused to accept my position.
Q1.18 I made implicit threats in case I did not comply with the other party's request.
Q1.19 I expressed strong displeasure with the other party's behavior when they challenged my stand.
Q1.20 I tried to win our position by any means.

2. Negotiation performance outcome
With reference to the same negotiation in (1) above. Please indicate the degree of agreement to each of the statements in describing the negotiation outcome.
(1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)

Q2.1 The solution found satisfied the goals and needs of both parties.
Q2.2 An optimal and creative solution to the problem was found.
Q2.3 There were further disagreements or escalation in conflict.
Q2.4 A deadlock was reached.
Q2.5 The issue was postponed until a better time.
Q2.6 I withdrew from a threatening situation.
Q2.7 There was a lack of basic information needed to construct solutions to the conflicts.
Q2.8 The dispute was difficult to resolve.
Q2.9 Some of each party's needs were satisfied but not all of them.
Q2.10 Relationship between the parties was kept in tact for future interaction.
Q2.11 Less conflict-laden environment was produced.
Q2.12 More behavioral compliance with both parties was achieved.
Q2.13 I ignored the needs and expectations of the other party.
Q2.14 Solution development was likely to be sub-optimal, resulting in wasted resources.
Q2.15 Task conflict was turned into relationship conflict.
Q2.16 The levels of conflict were reduced.
Q2.17 The agreement was difficult to reach.
Q2.18 A higher level of ongoing conflict was experienced.
Q2.19 More task conflict was experienced.
Q2.20 Less future disputes were likely made.
Q2.21 The negotiation process was a one-side decision-making process.

3. Intercultural awareness

(1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)

(interaction engagement)
Q3.1 I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally distinct counterpart and me.
Q3.2 I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally distinct person.
Q3.3 I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures, I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally distinct counterparts during our interaction.
Q3.4 I often show my culturally distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.
Q3.5 I am open minded to people from different cultures.

(respect of cultural differences)
Q3.6 I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.
Q3.7 I respect the values of people from different cultures.
Q3.8 I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.
Q3.9 I can tell when I have upset my culturally distinct counterpart during our interaction.
Q3.10 I don’t like to be with people from different cultures.
Q3.11 I think my culture is better than other cultures.

(interaction confidence)
Q3.12 I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.
Q3.13 I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.
Q3.14 I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
Q3.15 I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.
Q3.16 I can be as social I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.

(interaction enjoyment)
Q3.17 I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.
Q3.18 I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
Q3.19 I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.

(interaction attentiveness)
Q3.20 I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.
Q3.21 I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.
Q3.22 I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart’s subtle meanings during our interaction.

Appendix B

Normal P-P Plot of regression standardized residual: outcome variable performance
Appendix C

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Respondents’ education level